

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-6 are rejected. Claim 2 is canceled. Claims 1, 3 and 5-6 are amended. Claims 1 and 3-6 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

**I. In the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "165" has been used to designate both "light set attaching pin" (paragraph 0036, line 3) and "light attaching pin" (Paragraph 0036, line 4). Applicant has amended paragraph [0036] to overcome the drawing objections. Approval is respectfully requested.

**II. 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 6 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections for claim 6 is respectfully requested.

**III. 35 U.S.C. § 103**

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1-6 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,106,125 issued to Finn et al. ("Finn") and U.S. Patent Application No. 4,504,888 issued to Rosenthal ("Rosenthal"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

According to MPEP §2142 “[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.” (In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). Further, according to MPEP §2143.03, “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” “*All words in a claim must be considered* in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” (In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970), emphasis added.)

Applicant's amended claim 1 contains the limitations of “...a plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adapted to couple to a light box, each of the plurality of light fixture coupling brackets including a through-hole and coupled to a light bar coupling device, a first and second tightening handle, wherein said plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adaptable to couple a light bar having at least one light socket within said light box, said plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adaptable to couple to a removably and adjustable gripping device, said gripping device is rotatably adjusted around said light box, said gripping device coupled with the first and second tightening handles and the plurality of light fixture coupling brackets.

Applicant's amended claim 5 contains the limitations of “... a light bar having at least one light socket, said light bar including at least one removable gripping device, said gripping device including a gripping pin substantially centered on a rear portion of said light bar, said gripping pin removable from said gripping device, said gripping device removably coupled to a plurality of light fixture coupling brackets and first and second tightening handles, wherein said removable gripping device removably coupled to a light box having a plurality of expansion rods coupled to a first and second frame,

and each of a plurality of light fixture coupling devices removably coupled to the light bar.”

Finn discloses a lighting box. It is asserted in the Office Action that Finn illustrates a light bar 14. The light bar in Finn, however, is not an integrated light bar. That is, the light bar in Finn is a mounting bar where lights are mounted to the bar. The light bar in Finn uses c-clamps 90 to mount lights to the light bar 14. Clearly, Finn does not teach, disclose or suggest a light bar with at least one light socket. Further, Finn does not teach, disclose or suggest “a plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adapted to couple to a light box, each of the plurality of light fixture coupling brackets including a through-hole and coupled to a light bar coupling device, a first and second tightening handle, wherein said plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adaptable to couple a light bar having at least one light socket within said light box, said plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adaptable to couple to a removably and adjustable gripping device, said gripping device is rotatably adjusted around said light box, said gripping device coupled with the first and second tightening handles and the plurality of light fixture coupling brackets,” or “a light bar having at least one light socket, said light bar including at least one removable gripping device, said gripping device including a gripping pin substantially centered on a rear portion of said light bar, said gripping pin removable from said gripping device, said gripping device removably coupled to a plurality of light fixture coupling brackets and first and second tightening handles, wherein said removable gripping device removably coupled to a light box having a plurality of expansion rods coupled to a first and second frame, and each of a plurality of light fixture coupling devices removably coupled to the light bar.”

Rosenthal discloses a light having support means pivotally connected to the body to aim the light. Also disclosed is a light source 13, cooling device 17, collar 20, flanges 26 and mounting plate 12. Rosenthal does not teach, disclose or suggest a light bar with at least one light socket. Further, Rosenthal does not teach, disclose or suggest “a plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adapted to couple to a light box, each of the plurality of light fixture coupling brackets including a through-hole and coupled to a light bar coupling device, a first and second tightening handle, wherein said plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adaptable to couple a light bar having at least one light

socket within said light box, said plurality of light fixture coupling brackets adaptable to couple to a removably and adjustable gripping device, said gripping device is rotatably adjusted around said light box, said gripping device coupled with the first and second tightening handles and the plurality of light fixture coupling brackets," or "a light bar having at least one light socket, said light bar including at least one removable gripping device, said gripping device including a gripping pin substantially centered on a rear portion of said light bar, said gripping pin removable from said gripping device, said gripping device removably coupled to a plurality of light fixture coupling brackets and first and second tightening handles, wherein said removable gripping device removably coupled to a light box having a plurality of expansion rods coupled to a first and second frame, and each of a plurality of light fixture coupling devices removably coupled to the light bar."

Neither Finn, Rosenthal, nor the combination of the two teach, disclose or suggest all the limitations contained in Applicant's amended claims 1 and 5 as listed above. Since neither Finn, Rosenthal, nor the combination of the two teach, disclose or suggest all the limitations of Applicant's amended claims 1 and 5, there would not be any motivation to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, Applicant's amended claims 1 and 5 are not obvious over Finn in view of Rosenthal since a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met under MPEP §2142. Additionally, the claims that directly or indirectly depend from amended claims 1 and 5, namely claims 3-4, and 6, respectively, would also not be obvious over Finn in view of Rosenthal for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections for claims 1-6 are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-6 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 1, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on March 1, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jean Svoboda